

REMARKS

The present application was filed on July 19, 2001 with claims 1-25. Claims 1-25 remain pending and claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 are independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-6, 10, 11-16, 20, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,408 to Ledain et al. (hereinafter “Ledain”); and (ii) rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ledain in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,369 to Guay et al. (hereinafter “Guay”).

Applicant acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7-9, 17-19, 22 and 25.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-6, 10, 11-16, 20, 21, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ledain, Applicant asserts that Ledain fails to disclose each of the elements recited in independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 of the present invention.

Ledain discloses a log device that provides for the storage of file and system data within a main filesystem layout. A control program manages the storage of file and system data in data segments in the log device filesystem and selectively transfers the file and system data from the log device to the storage device.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 of the present invention recite techniques for managing data objects in a computer system. A log of at least a portion of accesses to the data objects is maintained. At least one cluster comprised of data objects accessed at substantially similar times is determined from the maintained log. The data objects comprising the at least one cluster are stored in close proximity to one another in a memory.

Initially, Applicant asserts that although the present invention and Ledain both discuss logs, the term “log,” as used in the subject claims and as defined by the present specification, is non-analogous to the log taught by Ledain. The log disclosed by Ledain stores updates made to disk storage, while the log recited in the claims of the present invention records accesses to data objects. The independent claims of the present invention recite techniques for managing these data objects in computer systems where a log of a portion of the accesses to the data objects is maintained.

Further, Ledain fails to disclose the determination of at least one cluster comprised of data objects accessed at substantially similar times from the maintained log, as recited in the independent claims of the present invention. In addressing this element of the independent claims, the Examiner cites a section of Ledain describing the independent optimization of the main filesystem through, for example, file clustering. This is a general statement regarding clustering that does not mention clusters of data objects accessed at substantially similar times, as required by the subject claims. Therefore, Ledain fails to anticipate the determination of a cluster from the maintained log, that comprises data objects accessed at substantially similar times.

Ledain also fails to disclose the storing of data objects comprising the cluster in close proximity to one another in a memory, as set forth in the subject claims. In addressing this element of the independent claims, the Examiner cites a portion of Ledain describing translation maps utilized to establish logical correlations between data blocks, as stored in log blocks within data segments. Again, this is a general statement regarding storing which does not teach or suggest storing data objects in close proximity to one another, as required by the independent claims. Therefore, Ledain fails to anticipate the storing of data objects, which were accessed at substantially similar times from the maintained log, in close proximity to one another in a memory.

Dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12-16, 20 and 23 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from respective independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Further, one or more of dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12-16, 20 and 23 recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-6, 10, 11-16, 20, 21, 23 and 24 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ledain in view of Guay, Applicant asserts that claims 4-6 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. The patentability of claim 1 is discussed above. Applicant further asserts that dependent claims 4-6 recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 4-6 is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. YOR920010243US1

In view of the above, Applicant believes that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 48,956  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-4547

Date: June 30, 2004